



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/897,788	07/21/97	PERINO	D 73305.P066

MM11/0914

TAREK N FAHMI
BLAKLEY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR ANDZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

EXAMINER
ABRAMS, N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2839	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/98 #4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

897788

Applicant(s)

Perino et al

Examiner

Abrams

Group Art Unit

2839

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address--

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The proposed restriction requirement discussed with Mr. Fahmi is withdrawn.

Title, "multi-position" is unclear and could be deleted.

This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

The abstract is unclear, lines 2, 3, 9, 12, etc. should refer to -- bus conductors --. Also numerals in parenthesis should be added to aid the reader. A new abstract on a separate sheet could be supplied.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. *8, 15 features must be shown. For claim 6,* Therefore, the claim ~~6~~ *figs. 8, 9* embodiments do not include a "spacer" (see parent claim 2). Claim 8 does not seem readable on the disclosed invention ~~must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).~~ No new matter should be entered.

Art Unit: 2839

Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

Claims 8 and 10-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8, exactly what is referred to is unclear, claim 19 is to a "circuit board" but recites connector structure therefore just what is being claimed is unclear; nor does term "complaint" seem correct. Claim 24, the "ground signal path" should be tied in with other structure recited in the claim.

For claims 10, 12, etc, the socket should be more clearly tied in with the substrate, i.e. -- the socket is adapted to be mounted on a substrate --. As now recited the claimed structure is confusingly set forth.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pond alone or in view of ^{Demler}~~Demler~~, Feldman, Patel, Larson, Thompson, Uberbacher, Ahiskali and Rasmussen.

The pond device includes a socket having bus conductors 21 with contact regions 33 and the conductors spaced apart as shown in figs. 3 and 4. It is obvious that such spacing would provide a predetermined electrical impedance.

Art Unit: 2839

For claim 2, blocks 29 define a dielectric spacer. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to form two or more buses as a combined busbar like 500 of Demler or 14 of Larson and with contacts 33 provided on each ~~or each~~ bus.

For claim 5, obvious to add elastomer backing at 33 in view of Thompson at 104.

For claim 9, obvious to form bars 21 with contacts for both sides of a circuit board as in Uberbacher. Such arrangement would met claim 10, note contact elements 21a, 21a. Also obvious, should issues arise, to mount the socket and busbars to a printed circuit board in view of Feldman at 46 and Demler, figs. 1, 2 at 106, 124, 116. Claim 11 also met by Pond busbars with the number of posts 21 being independent of the number of contacts 33. Formation of Pond buses with integral posts for circuit board mounting further taught by Patel and Ahiskali.

Claims 12-18 rejected using references applied as above.

For claim 24 and others should issues arise, obvious to include a ground bus 21 in Pond in view of Demler.

Claims 26, 31, 32, met by use of two ground posts in Pond system, modified as discussed above. For claims ~~32~~³², 33, 34, selection of a number of posts for attachment to printed circuit board ground trace and of ground-signal pattern of bars would have been an obvious matter of design depending on circuit requirements. Also obvious to use alternate ground-signal busses in view of Uberbacher.

Art Unit: 2839

For claim 19, it would have been obvious to use a circuit board with traces as in Larson Demler and Rasmussen, fig. 11 in the Pond combination. For all claims Rasmussen and Grabbe, fig. 4, further teach use of busses to interconnect circuit boards.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Demler alone or taken in view of Feldman, Pond, Grabbe, Ahiskali, Rasmussen, Thompson Patel Larson and Uberbacher.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, etch features taught by Demler at 500 or should issues arise considered obvious variations. For claims 10, 11 obvious to mount bus 500 to a circuit board by use contact elements at ends of each metal layer in view of Feldman, Pond at 21a, 21a, Patel and Ahiskali. For claim 12, two posts are readable as a plurality of posts. Also obvious to form 506 as compliant sockets to receive blades on the board 10. For claim 19, obvious to include circuit traces as in Larson, Grabbe and Rasmussen.

For claim 24, obvious to use bus 500 with plural components in view of Rasmussen, Larsen and Feldman fig. 1. Also obvious to provide each bus with as many connections as are required as in Larson fig. 6. For claim 34, see Demler, col 5, lines 10-20. Rasmussen and Grabbe applied as discussed above. Thompson and Uberbacher are used as above.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cobaugh in view of Thompson, Grabbe, Rasmussen, Patel Feldman, Pond Uberbacher and Demler.

For claim 1, see buses 64, 64 and contact regions 82, see col. 6, lines 10-18. Also obvious to form buses 64 with posts at their end for connection to board 34 in view of Pond,


Art Unit: 2839

Feldman and Patel and to use the busses for circuit lines such as 34 of Rasmussen or as shown in Grabbe or for alternate ground and signal lines as in Uberbacher. Thompson and Uberbacher are used as above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number (703) 308-1729.

Abrams/ds

09/09/98


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322